

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROGELIO MAY RUIZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

M. STANE, ET. AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-00236-DAD-HBK

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S  
DUPLICATIVE MOTION TO PROCEED *IN  
FORMA PAUPERIS*

(Doc. Nos. 24, 25)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time, filed July 26, 2022. (Doc. No. 24). Plaintiff seeks an extension of time to file objections to the Findings and Recommendations issued on July 15, 2022. (Doc. No. 24 at 1). Plaintiff states he received the Court's July 15, 2022 Findings and Recommendations five days later on July 20, and had to wait to attend the law library because he has access only two times a week. (*Id.*). For good cause shown, Plaintiff's motion is granted. Plaintiff must deliver his objections, if any, to correctional authorities for mailing to the Court no later than September 2, 2022.

Also pending is Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, filed August 8, 2022. (Doc. No. 25, "IFP Motion"). Plaintiff previously filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on April 27, 2022. (Doc. No. 13). The Court issued the Findings and Recommendations and recommended the district court deny Plaintiff's earlier filed IFP motion due to his three-strike status under § 1915(g). (Doc. No. 23). Thus, Plaintiff's second filed motion is duplicative and

1 shall be stricken.

2 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

3 Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (Doc. No. 24) is GRANTED to the limited  
4 extent he must give objections, if any, to correctional authorities for mailing to the Court **no later**  
5 **than September 2, 2022.**

6 Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 25) is stricken as  
7 duplicative.

8  
9 Dated: August 12, 2022

  
10 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA  
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28